

adding the word "directly." Thus, the January 22, 2008 Amendment could not be the basis for the finality of the present Office Action. The application of a new reference Schlack that was never before applied was not necessitated by an amendment. In any case, as discussed above, Schlack does not disclose or suggest or supplying the subject matter missing in Masamichi, as discussed below.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Masamichi et al. (JP 2003-085347) in view of Schlack (U.S. Publication No. 2007/0226628). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Masamichi discloses a concept analysis unit citing paragraph [0046] and asserts that Masamichi discloses an evaluation unit configured to evaluate values of activities, concepts and groups of activities also citing paragraph [0046]. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Masamichi is directed to supporting analysis which associates quantitative analysis of communication link log of an organization communication and qualitative information such as an event relative to organization communication. See paragraph [0007]. Thus, on the outset, Masamichi is not directed to concept analysis as asserted by the Office Action.

In fact, "concept analysis" is not discussed anywhere in Masamichi. Masamichi does discuss "event." As disclosed in paragraph [0037], Masamichi provides an event edit means 24 which is a user interface to identify contents of an event. For example, an event may be a "characteristic utterance" found in an electronic communication, for example. However, Masamichi does not disclose analysis of the characteristic utterance, but merely discloses that a user may identify a characteristic utterance. The remainder of Masamichi then discusses analyzing the quantitative nature of the communication in relationship to the identified event.

Paragraph [0046] discloses nothing regarding analysis of concepts. Rather, this paragraph merely tracks quantitative data regarding an event such as an utterance.

Accordingly, Masamichi does not disclose or suggest any information regarding concept analysis.

Masamichi also does not disclose or suggest or even recognize anything regarding evaluating values of activities. There is nothing in all of Masamichi that discusses evaluating the worth or value of anything. In particular, paragraph [0046] does not provide any disclosure or suggestion for evaluation of anything. Rather, Masamichi in paragraph [0046] only discloses connecting quantitative analysis with identified events which is the object announced in paragraph [0007].

In view of the above, Masamichi does not disclose, suggest or even recognize concept analysis or evaluating values of activities as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11.

The Office Action admits that Masamichi does not disclose inquiring directly to groups concerning activities performed by the groups, but asserts that Schlack discloses the missing subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Schlack is directed to facilitation of virtual communities. In particular, Schlack discloses a client server system that provides a virtual location for members to develop a virtual online community. The members are invited to participate in the community and the community is brought together to achieve a predetermined goal. See paragraph [0006]. Schlack further discloses:

The main purpose of the enterprise community is 1) a forum for exposing content developed within the community to the enterprise at large, and 2) as a forum for interacting around topics of interest to the entire enterprise.

Thus, Schlack is not directed to concept analysis or evaluating values of activities. Rather, Schlack is directed to a communication system that permits creation of a community throughout an enterprise to encourage sharing of ideas. There is nothing in Schlack that discloses or suggests analyzing the ideas or evaluating the worth of the ideas. Thus, Schlack

does not disclose concept analysis and evaluating values of activities recited in claims 1, 6 and 11 that are lacking in Masamichi.

The Office Action points to paragraph [0020] asserting that Schlack discloses surveys. However, the "surveys" disclosed in paragraph [0020] in Schlack are not surveys concerning activities performed by the groups. Rather, the surveys are directed to the purpose of the virtual communities and that is sharing of ideas. In fact, Schlack discloses: "typical activities inside each community might include dialogue, surveys, and gallery exhibits specific to the community ...." Thus, the surveys themselves are actually activities suggested by Schlack. The surveys do not survey the activities being performed by the community. Thus, Schlack does not supply the subject matter admitted to be missing in Masamichi.

The Office Action further asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Schlack with Masamichi. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, Masamichi is directed to analysis of organizational communication in making a connection between qualitative information and quantitative analysis of the communication. Schlack is directed to generation of a virtual community to set up a forum for interaction around topics of interest in an enterprise in which surveys may be one of the many activities within the community. As discussed above, the surveys discussed in Schlack is an activity by the groups but the surveys are sharing of ideas, not the activities of the community. There is nothing in Masamichi that would benefit from such a survey, because Masamichi is directed to a connection between quantitative analysis of a communication and a qualitative information of communications. Performing surveys for sharing ideas has no place in Masamichi. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Masamichi with Schlack because such a combination is not only not suggested, there is no purpose for such a combination and the combination would yield no benefits for either Schlack or Masamichi.

In view of the above, Masamichi and Schlack individually or in combination would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1, 6 and 11. Claims 2-5 and 16 depend from claim 1, claims 7-10 and 17 depend from claim 6 and claims 12-15 and 18 depend from claim 11. Thus, Masamichi and Schlack individually or in combination would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1-18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Moshe K. Wilensky  
Registration No. 56,263

JAO:MKW/jgg

Date: July 11, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---